

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 12, 2000

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room,  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair  
ADOT: Chuck Eaton for Dan Lance  
\*Avondale: William Bates  
Buckeye: Joe Blanton  
Chandler: Bryan Patterson  
\*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell  
Gilbert: Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Jim Book  
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel  
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis  
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom  
Buick

\*Mesa: Jeff Martin  
Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen  
Peoria: David Moody  
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair  
RPTA: Ken Driggs  
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf for John C.  
Little  
\*Surprise: Ellis Perl  
Tempe: Glenn Kephart

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Eric  
Iwersen, Tempe  
\*Street Committee: Grant Anderson, Glendale  
ITS Committee: Jim Book

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,  
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation  
\*Telecommunications Advisory Group:  
Jim Hull

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG  
Bob Antila, RPTA  
Stuart Boggs, MAG  
Peggy Carpenter, Scottsdale  
Dawn Coomer, MAG  
Jon Green, Parsons  
Bill Hayden, ADOT  
Terry Johnson, Glendale

Sarath Joshua, MAG  
Mark Schlappi, MAG  
William J. Stephens, Earth Millennium  
Project  
Chris Voigt, MAG  
Henry Wall, Kimley-Horn  
Kevin Wallace, Mesa  
Paul Ward, MAG

1. Call to Order

Fred Carpenter, Chairman , called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 31, 2000 and November 21, 2000

Turning to the first order of business, Chairman Carpenter asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Stuart Boggs noted that there were two errors in the minutes. He said the Pedestrian Working Group was incorrectly identified as the Pedestrian Advisory Group. He also noted that on page four of the minutes for November 21, 2000 the Transportation Review Committee is incorrectly identified as the Transportation Advisory Committee.

The Chairman asked if there were any other corrections. Jim Book noted that his motion called for ADOT to seek other funding rather than reallocating funds. Tami Ryall also observed that the intent of the discussion and recommendation was to replace, not reallocate funds. Glenn Kephart also noted that he had voted in favor of agenda item #2 at the November 21, 2000 special meeting. There being no further discussion Chairman Carpenter asked for a motion. Jim Book moved to approve the minutes as amended, with David Moody seconding. The minutes as amended were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote.

3. Call to the Audience

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced William J. Stephens representing the Earth Millennium Project. Mr. Stephens told the Committee that he was also there representing the River Keepers group. He felt that governance issues needed to be addressed since he believed there was too much bickering between Valley cities and towns over transportation programs and priorities. Mr. Stephens expressed concern that the region was using up its existing roadway space and he suggested that MAG and ADOT consider utilizing development opportunities over and under existing roadways to increase capacity. He also urged the Committee to consider development of high speed “bullet trains” to move freight and passengers between urban centers. Mr. Stephens concluded his remarks with a statement endorsing the use of energy conservation, noting that the world was running out of petroleum and fringe developments were wasteful of energy resources. Chairman Carpenter thanked Mr. Stephens for his remarks.

4. Transportation Management Report

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Eric Anderson of MAG who told that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had sent a letter to the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) regarding the CMAQ project funding requests submitted by that agency. FHWA indicated in their letter that they had problems

with four of the submitted projects. David Moody asked what the implications were for these CMAQ funding requests. He wanted to know if FHWA could kill a project regardless of the fact that it had been approved by the Transportation Review Committee. Mr. Anderson replied that he would be setting up a meeting with representatives from FHWA and ADOT to seek a resolution to the issues raised by the letter.

In other business, Mr. Anderson briefed the Committee on the CANAMEX Forum scheduled for Thursday, December 14, 2000 in the Town of Buckeye. The purpose of the forum was to seek consensus on phase 2 of the CANAMEX study. Mr. Anderson also told the Committee that the draft MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) would be available for review in January. He also briefed the Committee on the status of the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Mr. Anderson noted that the LRTP was being updated concurrently with the development of Phase I of the new Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This was to insure that a conformity lapse would not occur if adoption of the RTP was delayed for some reason.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

---

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter asked if anyone wished to hold a hearing on any item up for consent. There being no response, the Chairman asked for a motion. Jim Book made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Dave Moody seconded the motion and it was subsequently passed by a unanimous voice vote.

6. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan Update

(Approved as part of Consent Agenda)

7. Report on the MAG Freeway Program

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter, introduced Eric Anderson who briefed the Committee on partial and full freeway segment openings that were slated over the next few months. Mr. Anderson told the Committee that there would be a “Picnic on the Price” freeway on Saturday, December 16<sup>th</sup> to highlight the opening of this limited access facility which will serve the southeast valley community of Chandler. Mr. Anderson also noted that there would be staged openings of additional portions of the Pima freeway over the next few months. He noted that the freeway construction program was on track for completion in 2007.

8. Progress on the Regional Transportation Plan Update

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Stuart Boggs of MAG, who briefed the Committee on the status of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) development process. Mr. Boggs told the Committee that the RTP would replace the current

Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). He noted that the RTP would provide a new policy framework to guide transportation investments over the next 20 years. Mr. Boggs stated that the planning process would emphasize public involvement to insure broad based support by the public of the plan.

Mr. Boggs told the Committee that the county population will have more than doubled in 2040. He also noted that by 2040, the MAG traffic models showed the majority of the region's freeways and major streets would be operating at or near level of service F.

Mr. Boggs went on to describe the development process for the RTP. He noted that the plan's development would involve two phases completed over two years. Phase I would define the issues, policies, goals and objectives of the plan. It would also establish performance measures and priority criteria that would guide the selection of projects in Phase II. Turning to Phase II, Mr. Boggs noted that plan priorities would be developed as well as major improvements and that transportation corridors would be identified. Performance measures would be used to evaluate identified improvements. These performance measures would also be used to evaluate the success of the various programs and improvements identified by the plan.

Mr. Boggs summarized the major milestones of Phase I and noted that it was projected for completion in December of 2001. He also observed that Phase II would begin immediately following the completion of Phase I and would be completed sometime in December of 2002. One of the key components of Phase I would be a series of half day expert panel forums that will examine external factors and future trends that will affect the Valley's transportation needs and its future investment priorities. The forums would be built around four issue areas: Demographics & Social Change; Land Use & Urban Development; New Economy & Technology; and Environment & Resources. The forum would be preceded by a kickoff dinner where a nationally known speaker would comment on the issues, challenges and opportunities that will impact the region.

Mr. Anderson noted that the first meeting of the Regional Transportation Advisors group would be held on Wednesday, December 13, 2000, starting at 10:00 a.m. He told the Committee that the Advisors group was composed of the MAG policy, modal and technical committee chairs as well as staff members from ADOT, MAG and RPTA. The meeting would address an overview of the work plan and expert forums and would cover the major factors involved and how they will likely affect transportation.

Mr. Anderson noted that the projected doubling of the region's population by 2040 would certainly affect the level of service on the region's road network, but he also observed that, realistically, mitigating factors would also come into play. Saying that, he felt that the subject definitely needed further study. Mr. Anderson also noted that the subject of where the region is headed would also be discussed at the forthcoming Management Committee Retreat on December 15<sup>th</sup>.

Tami Ryall asked when the forums would be held. It was expected that the forums would be completed in the February/March time frame. Glenn Kephart asked had, and/or how, the experts would be selected. Eric reported that no, the experts had not yet been selected, although suggestions identified Anthony Downs, and Sandy Rosenblum as possible panelists.

9. Loop 303 Alignment

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Mark Schlappi of MAG who briefed the Committee on the Loop 303 alignment study. Mr. Schlappi described the size and location of the study area. He noted that the analysis of alternatives had looked at five alignments: New River, Carefree, Lone Mountain, Dixileta, and the alignment shown in the 1985 election. Mr. Schlappi observed that the predominate land use in the study area was open space. He also noted that population projections to 2040 showed the highest population density would be along the south edge of the study area. Mr. Schlappi observed that all the studied alignments were located in an area that would still have a relatively low population density in 2040.

Mr. Schlappi noted that among the factors that constrain the location of roadways in the study area are the topography and land conservation initiatives. He observed that the proposed Lone Mountain alignment would require a long bridge structure to carry it over the Agua Fria impoundment. Mr. Schlappi also noted that the proposed Dixileta alignment would not be able to extend east of I-17 due to the presence of both a planned wastewater treatment plant and a mountain.

Mr. Schlappi noted that the study area's road system included all road facilities both existing or planned in the North Valley. He observed that additional general travel lanes were assumed on I-17 from Loop 101 to New River and HOV Lanes from Loop 101 to Anthem Way. Mr. Anderson pointed out that the study area had been expanded in response to the requests of Scottsdale stakeholders to allow for the analysis of traffic impacts from the proposed Loop 303 alignments on that city. Mr. Schlappi noted that the 2020 traffic model runs for the Loop 303 alignments does not show much of an impact on Scottsdale.

Mr. Schlappi discussed the analysis process used for evaluation of the alignments. This included an assessment of level of service, out of direction travel, delay, and the performance of select travel links. The latter allowed for an assessment of traffic patterns associated with each alignment. Mr. Schlappi also told the Committee that a screen line analysis had been performed to gauge traffic volumes on the various alignments as well as on the overall study area road network. In general, Mr. Schlappi noted that there was not much difference in performance between the studied alternatives. He also noted that the farther south an alignment was located, the better it addressed east-west circulation needs.

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Schlappi asked if there were any questions. Jack Tevlin asked what the plan was for the Dixileta alignment. Would it be built as an arterial roadway? Mr. Schlappi replied that it would not. Mr. Anderson noted that the presence of a Mountain

east of I-17 as well as Phoenix's planned wastewater treatment facility, would preclude extending Dixileta west from its existing terminus to I-17. This lack of a direct connection to the area east of I-17 made this alignment less attractive than the other options. Mr. Tevlin stated that he believed that the New River alignment was worthy of study.

Michelle Korf asked if the alignment recommendation included the area east of I-17. Mr. Anderson replied that it did not. Chairman Carpenter noted that the area east of I-17 would not be addressed by the study of alignments. Ms. Ryall wondered what the staff recommendation intended as far as New River was concerned. Mr. Anderson replied that the New River alignment was part of the North Valley Forum discussion. The traffic analysis indicates that this alignment would provide a bypass for I-17 traffic seeking to access the west valley.

David Moody observed that New River Road already exists. He also noted that the traffic projections were based on all approved land developments. Mr. Moody suggested that the Committee take a long view and act to preserve the New River corridor in anticipation of future development.

Glenn Kephart felt that the Committee was ahead of the process in identifying a locally preferred alternative when the environmental assessment has not even begun. He wondered what FHWA would consider to be the logical termini of the project.

Mr. Anderson noted that the alignment would be subject to the results of the environmental impact statement. He felt that it would be better to start with an alignment that the communities endorse than with a blank sheet of paper. Mr. Anderson noted that FHWA was comfortable with I-17 as a logical termini but was still assessing the west termini for the corridor. He said that conversations with FHWA were ongoing.

Michelle Korf asked if the proposed corridor study would include other transportation modes. David Moody replied that the environmental assessment would evaluate other modes that could serve the corridor. Ms. Korf noted that Bus Rapid Transit might be an option for this corridor. Mr. Moody noted that the staff recommendation just placed a line on the map. Like the line identified in the 1985 election, it is subject to change through the environmental assessment process. He also pointed out that the west valley is still trying to catch up to the transportation needs of current development.

Chuck Eaton suggested referring to the route as a corridor and not as an alignment. Jim Book stressed the need to identify a locally preferred corridor in order to give the environmental study some direction. He noted that Loop 303, while not currently funded, is still a part of the Long Range Transportation Plan, unlike the Paradise Freeway which was eliminated from the freeway program. Mr. Book felt that they had an obligation to the voters who voted for Loop 303 as part of the 1985 election.

Jack Tevlin made a motion to recommend the Lone Mountain Corridor as the preferred

alternative and that it be constructed as a limited access parkway with access only at major arterial intersections and sufficient right-of-way would be purchased for a fully controlled access facility. In addition, the New River Alignment would be designated for further study in the Regional Plan. Jim Book seconded the motion. In the subsequent discussion Tami Ryall suggested removing the reference to New River from the motion. Glenn Kephart indicated that he would be voting against the motion since it identified a specific alignment. He felt that identifying a preferred alternative prior to doing an environmental assessment was premature. There being no further discussion, Chairman Carpenter called for the vote. The motion passed with a vote of thirteen in favor, Glenn Kephart voting nay, and Tami Ryall abstaining.

10. Park & Ride Lot Site Selection Study

Chairman Carpenter introduced Chuck Kirchner of KJS Associates who briefed the Committee on the process and findings of the MAG Park & Ride Site Selection Study. Mr. Kirchner noted that the study had produced a number of working papers, included target area analysis, specific site analysis and facility design. This analysis had included input from eight agency forums over the past year. Mr. Kirchner related how the study had identified and analyzed five candidate sites in each of twenty target areas.

Mr. Kirchner then briefed the Committee on the project recommendations for near and long term prioritization of park and ride sites in the region. He noted that funding for construction of the near term facilities was programmed for the most part in the existing MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with some additional funding expected in the upcoming TIP. He also observed that while funding had not yet been programmed for the long term park and ride priorities that land banking should be considered to preserve the sites for future development. Mr. Kirchner noted that land banking could be constrained by local funding limitations as well as due to the environmental assessment requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process. He suggested that MAG and the Committee work closely with FTA to insure that any local land banking initiatives preserve federal funding options.

Chris Voigt then summarized the staff recommendation and noted that the study would be presented to the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council at their January meetings for their consideration. Mr. Voigt also advised the Committee that they had received comments from RPTA and the City of Tempe requesting that the Tempe lot identified as priority #11 be advanced to replace a lot that Peoria had decided not to develop at this time. He noted that advancing the Tempe lot would ensure that it will be completed in time for the start of service of the Light Rail Transit line in 2006. Chairman Carpenter asked what the time frame was for construction of the near term park and ride lot priorities. Mr. Kirchner replied that the study assumed construction by 2006.

Glenn Kephart observed that it would be preferable if the Tempe lot were advanced to 2005 but noted that doing so would require moving another project back. Chuck Eaton observed that park and ride lots that are developed with state highway funds should be targeted at serving High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the regional freeway system. Clarifying his suggestion Mr. Kephart felt that the Tempe lot should be moved to #7 in the list of priorities. Jack Tevlin noted that he would not have a problem with this change in priorities.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Carpenter asked for a motion. Glen Kephart made a motion, with Jack Tevlin seconding, to recommend approval of the draft program for ten lots with the understanding that the programming for the lot in Tempe, listed as Priority #11 in the draft consultant report, be advanced and programmed seventh, with lots in Phoenix, Mesa and Goodyear deferred accordingly and programmed eighth, ninth and tenth, respectively, with the final programming for all lots to be done as part of the annual MAG programming process for all projects.

The Chairman asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Ken Driggs observed that the recommendation just set priorities for funding, but did not actually program the funds. Chuck Eaton noted that funding had already been allocated for the near term priority projects.

Bryan Jungwirth asked which list was included in the recommendation, the priority list of the draft report's executive summary, or the programming list. Mr. Voigt replied that the priority list in the report was included in the existing recommendation. Mr. Driggs noted that the Committee was voting on priorities not programming funds. Chairman Carpenter asked if there was a need for two actions. He then suggested that a vote be called on the first motion. A vote was then called on Mr. Kephart's motion. The recommendation was passed unanimously.

The Chairman then asked for another motion. David Moody made a motion, with Jim Book seconding, to recommend approval of the draft final project report and project recommendations for twenty new park and ride lots for addition to the MAG Long Range Transportation Plan, subject to conformity analysis. This motion was unanimously approved by a subsequent vote of the Committee.

11. Review of MAG Federal Funds Projections for the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Paul Ward of MAG who briefed the Committee on the federal funding projects for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Ward told the Committee that the amount of federal funds available over time is influenced by several factors including expected and unexpected increases in federal apportionments, variations in Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA), and obligation authority. Mr. Ward noted that base apportionments were projected to grow to \$64 million per year.



Mr. Ward also talked about the overall growth in federal transportation funding to Arizona under the successive federal program authorizations, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and its successor, the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century (TEA-21). He noted that appropriations to the MAG region under ISTEA ranged from \$8 to 40 million per year. Under TEA-21, that has grown to \$65 million per year. Mr. Ward told the Committee that the state has been contributing more and more to the highway trust funds compared to other states. Between FY 2002 and 2006, there will be an addition \$15.3 million in Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding to MAG. Mr. Ward noted that during the same period, there will be an additional \$11.8 million in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding available to MAG.

The address this additional funding, Mr. Ward outlined a process that will assist in the programming of these additional funds. Project requests would be due to MAG by January 5, 2001. They would subsequently be reviewed and ranked by the modal technical advisory committees in January. Mr. Ward stated that these project rankings would be reviewed by the Transportation Review Committee at its meeting on January 23, 2001. At its meeting of February 27, 2001, the TRC would then recommend a MAG Federally Funded Program for FY 2002-2006 as part of the Draft FY 2002-2006 MAG TIP being submitted for an air quality conformity analysis. Mr. Ward stated that the recommendation would then be considered by the MAG Management Committee and the MAG Regional Council at their March meetings.

Mr. Ward noted that programming this additional funding would necessitate opening the individual years of the TIP rather than focusing on FY 2006. He stated that all projects already submitted, including those not currently funded, would be considered. Existing project requests did not need to be resubmitted unless the requesting agency was seeking to amend the original funding request. Mr. Ward suggested that agencies submitting projects provide three years that the project could be funded in since this would aid in the juggling of projects.

12. Cooperatively Developed MAG/ADOT/RPTA Project Rankings for State Transportation Projects

Turning to the next order of business, Chairman Carpenter introduced Chuck Eaton representing the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). Mr. Eaton briefed the Committee on the cooperative process utilized by ADOT to rank state transportation projects. He noted that the federal guidance to state departments of transportation specified that funding estimates be developed cooperatively between ADOT, MAG, and the Regional Public Transit Authority (RPTA).

Mr. Eaton told the Committee that a stakeholder meeting had been held on August 1, 2000 to solicit local needs. He went on to say that local jurisdictions were asked to submit funding requests by September 9<sup>th</sup>. Bryan Patterson noted that the City of Chandler had been unaware of the process so had not submitted any requests. Mr. Anderson noted that MAG

had sent a letter out to all MAG member agencies notify them of the stakeholder forum. Tami Ryall suggested that local officials had not understood the importance of the meeting so may have not sent representatives to the August meeting.

Mr. Eaton discussed available transportation funding. He noted that in FY 2006 approximately \$152.1 million was projected to be available in RABA funds. Approximately \$151.9 million in project requests had been received for this time period. Mr. Eaton briefed the Committee on the major projects identified through the cooperative process. These included the US 60 design build project between I-10 and Val Vista Road in FY 2001, and the construction of additional lanes, lighting and sound walls on I-17 between Peoria Avenue and Greenway Road in FY 2002. He noted that the Cities of Glendale and Phoenix had expressed interest in advancing the design and construction of HOV lanes on SR 51 between Glendale Avenue and Shea Boulevard.

David Moody asked if input had been limited to ADOT, MAG and RPTA and had not included the region's municipalities. He noted that Grand Avenue was an example of this lack of communication with a six lane arterial being carried across a four lane intersection. Mr. Eaton noted that ADOT's district engineers had provided an assessment of regional transportation needs.

Chairman Carpenter asked what was MAG's share of the statewide transportation program. Mr. Eaton replied that MAG's share was 42.5 percent. The Chairman asked why it was such a large percentage. Mr. Eaton noted that during the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) discussions the goal was to achieve a more equitable allocation of state transportation dollars. He noted that the MAG region contributes more in taxes than it actually receives in transportation funding. Chairman Carpenter asked if this RAAC process was held each year. Mr. Eaton replied that it was an annual process.

Mr. Anderson noted that there was room for improvement in the cooperative process. He stated that ADOT and MAG will be forming a working group to study how to improve the process. He noted that due to the short time frame before the current program must be approved any changes would probably not be implemented until a subsequent planning cycle.

Tami Ryall asked if it would be possible to have a more integrated discussion of the project rankings in January. Eric Anderson replied that the project rankings were scheduled to go to the Management Committee and the Regional Council in January. He observed that the next regular meeting of the TRC would be at the end of January but a special meeting earlier in the month might be possible. Jim Book made a motion that the discussion be tabled until the January meeting. Glenn Kephart seconded the motion. Chairman Carpenter asked if anyone had a suggestion for a meeting date for the special meeting. Eric Anderson noted that the latest the Committee could meet in order to hear the items before the next Management Committee meeting would be January 9, 2001. He told the Committee that he would check for room availability.

Chris Plumb asked whether the cities and town should be included in the process of identifying and ranking projects. Mr. Eaton replied that the current process was a cooperative effort of ADOT, MAG and RPTA. Mr. Plumb asked when this project list was first presented to the Committee? Mr. Anderson replied that it had not been presented to the Committee before today's meeting. He also noted that it had not yet gone to the Management Committee or the Regional Council.

Referring to the four months that had elapsed since the August stakeholder meeting, Mr. Plumb noted that it gave the impression that the ADOT, RPTA and MAG staffs had made the programming decisions. Eric Anderson pointed out that projects were solicited at the August stakeholder meeting but not ranked. He also noted that this cooperative process for relatively new and that prior to its adoption, ADOT had done their own project selection without the involvement of MAG or the RPTA.

Tami Ryall asked Mr. Eaton what the timing was for the process. Mr. Eaton responded that the ADOT Executive Board would have a work study session in January. This would be followed by Board consideration of the draft ADOT program in February. The final revised program would be considered by the ADOT Executive Board and the MAG Regional Council in June. Jim Book asked why projects were shown for all years of the TIP. Mr. Anderson pointed out that this was based upon projections of additional federal funding.

Tami Ryall asked if it would be possible to have a more integrated discussion of the ADOT program in January. Eric Anderson noted that the program recommendations were scheduled to go to the Management Committee and the Regional Council in January. Since the next scheduled meeting of the TRC was not until January 27<sup>th</sup>, he believed that another meeting of the Committee would need to be scheduled early in January in order to have a discussion prior to the Management Committee and Regional Council meetings.

Jim Book made a motion, which was seconded by Glenn Kephart, to table the remaining items until the January meeting. Chairman Carpenter asked for a meeting date. Eric Anderson suggested January 9<sup>th</sup>, which would be prior to the Management Committee meeting. There being no further discussion, the motion was subsequently approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

13. HOV Study Presentation

Tabled.

14. Value Lane Study

Tabled.

15. Next Meeting Date

Turning to the last order of business, Vice-Chairman Tevlin told the Committee that the next regular meeting will be held on January 23, 2001, at 10:00 a.m. in the Saguaro Room, 2nd floor, MAG offices.

There being no other business, the Vice-Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:26 a.m.